arXiv:1409.0098v3 [cs.DS] 8 Jul 2015

An optimal algorithm for the weighted backup 2-center problem on a tree

Hung-Lung Wang

Institute of Information and Decision Sciences
National Taipei University of Business, Taiwan

Abstract. In this paper, we are concerned with the weighted backup 2-center problem on a tree. The backup 2-center problem is a kind of center facility location problem, in which one is asked to deploy two facilities, with a given probability to fail, in a network. Given that the two facilities do not fail simultaneously, the goal is to find two locations, possibly on edges, that minimize the expected value of the maximum distance over all vertices to their closest functioning facility. In the weighted setting, each vertex in the network is associated with a nonnegative weight, and the distance from vertex u to v is weighted by the weight of u. With the strategy of prune-and-search, we propose a linear time algorithm, which is asymptotically optimal, to solve the weighted backup 2-center problem on a tree.

1 Introduction

Facility location problems are widely investigated in the fields of operations research and theoretical computer science. The p-center problem is a classic one in this line of investigation. Given a graph G with positive edge lengths, a supply set Σ , and a demand set Δ, the p-center problem asks for p elements $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_p$ from Σ such that $\max_{y\in\Delta} \min_{1\leqslant i\leqslant p} d(x_i, y)$ is minimized, where $d(x, y)$ denotes the distance from x to y in G. Conventionally, $\Delta, \Sigma \in \{V, A\}$, where V and A are the set of vertices and *points* of G, respectively. A point of a graph is a location on an edge of the graph, and is identified with the edge it locates on and the distance to an end vertex of the edge. The p-center problem in general graphs, for arbitrary p, is NP-hard [9], and the best possible approximation ratio is 2, unless NP=P [11]. When p is fixed or the network topology is specific, many efficient algorithms were proposed [4, 5, 7].

There are many generalized formulations of the center problem, like the capacitated center problem [1] and the minmax regret center problem [2, 3]. The backup center problem is formulated based on the *reliability model* [12, 13], in which the deployed facilities may sometimes fail, and the demands served by these facilities have to be reassigned to functioning facilities. More precisely, in the backup p-center problem, facilities may fail with *failure probabilities* $\rho_1, \rho_2, \ldots, \rho_p$. Given that the facilities do not fail simultaneously, the goal is to find p locations that minimize the expected value of the maximum distance

over all vertices to their closest functioning facility. We leave the formal problem definition to Section 2. The backup p-center problem is NP-hard since it is a generalized formulation of the p-center problem. For $p = 2$, Wang et al. [15] proposed a linear time algorithm for the problem on trees. When the edges are of identical length, Hong and Kang [8] proposed a linear time algorithm on interval graphs. Recently, Bhattacharya et al. [6] consider a weighted formulation of the backup 2-center problem, in which each vertex is associated with a nonnegative weight, and the distance from vertex u to v is weighted by the weight of u. They proposed $O(n)$-, $O(n \log n)$-, $O(n^2)$-, and $O(n^2 \log n)$-time algorithms on paths, trees, cycles, and unicycles, respectively, where n is the number of vertices.

In this paper, we focus on the weighted backup 2-center problem on a tree and design a linear time algorithm to solve this problem. The algorithm is asymptotically optimal, and therefore improves the current best result on trees, given by Bhattacharya et al. [6]. The strategy of our algorithm is *prune-and-search*, which is widely applied in solving distance-related problems [10, 14]. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formally define the problem and briefly review the result given by Bhattacharya et al. [6]. Based on their observations, a further elaboration on the objective function is given. In Section 3, we design the linear time algorithm, and concluding remarks are given in Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

Let $T = (V, E)$ be a tree, on which each vertex v is associated with a nonnegative weight w_v, and each edge is associated with a nonnegative length. A location on an edge is identified as a *point*, and the set of points of T is denoted by A. The unique path between two points u and v is denoted by $\pi(u, v)$, and the *distance* $d(u, v)$ between two points u and v is defined to be the sum of lengths of the edges on $\pi(u, v)$. The *weighted distance* from vertex u to point a is defined as $w_u d(u, a)$. The *eccentricity* of a point a is defined as

$$\varepsilon(a) = \max_{u \in V} w_u d(u, a),$$

and the point with minimum eccentricity is said to be the *weighted center* of T. Note that the weighted center of a tree is unique. For $U \subseteq V$, the eccentricity of a vertex a w.r.t. U is defined as

$$\varepsilon(a, U) = \max_{u \in U} w_u d(u, a).$$

Let a_1 and a_2 be two points of T. The partition $\Pi(a_1, a_2)$ of V is defined as (V_1, V_2), where $V_1 = \{v \in V : d(v, a_1) \leqslant d(v, a_2)\}$ and $V_2 = V \setminus V_1$. A *weighted 2-center* consists of two points c_1 and c_2 minimizing

$$\varepsilon_2(a_1, a_2) = \max\{\varepsilon(a_1, V_1), \varepsilon(a_2, V_2)\},$$

where $(V_1, V_2) = \Pi(a_1, a_2)$. We denote a weighted 2-center by $\{c_1, c_2\}$. Unlike the weighted center of a tree, there may be more than one weighted 2-center. Now we are ready to define the weighted backup 2-center problem.

Problem 1 (the weighted backup 2-center problem). Given a tree $T = (V, E)$ and two real numbers ρ_1 and ρ_2 in $[0, 1)$, the weighted backup 2-center problem asks for a point pair (b_1, b_2) minimizing $\psi_{\rho_1,\rho_2} \colon A \times A \to \mathbb{R}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{\rho_1,\rho_2}(a_1, a_2) \equiv (1-\rho_1)(1-\rho_2)\max\{\varepsilon(a_1, V_1), \varepsilon(a_2, V_2)\} \\ +\rho_2(1-\rho_1)\varepsilon(a_1) + \rho_1(1-\rho_2)\varepsilon(a_2),\end{aligned}$$

and $(V_1, V_2) = \Pi(a_1, a_2)$.

To ease the presentation, we assume that $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = \rho$. With the assumption, minimizing ψ_{ρ_1,ρ_2} is equivalent to minimizing $\psi \colon A \times A \to \mathbb{R}$, where

$$\psi(a_1, a_2) \equiv (1-\rho)\max\{\varepsilon(a_1, V_1), \varepsilon(a_2, V_2)\} + \rho(\varepsilon(a_1) + \varepsilon(a_2)).$$

We note here that all the proofs in this paper can immediately be extended to the case where failure probabilities are different. Moreover, b_1 and b_2 are not restricted to be deployed on different points. If b_1 and b_2 are identical, the point must be the weighted center, as shown in Proposition 1.

Proposition 1. *Let (b_1, b_2) be a weighted backup 2-center of tree T. If b_1 and b_2 are identical, then it is the weighted center of T.*

Proof. Let c be the weighted center of T. Suppose to the contrary that $b_1 = b_2$, but $b_1 \neq c$. Since $b_1 = b_2$, we have $\{v \in V \colon d(v, b_1) \leqslant d(v, b_2)\} = V$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(b_1, b_2) &= (1-\rho)\max\{\varepsilon(b_1, V), \varepsilon(b_2, \emptyset)\} + \rho(\varepsilon(b_1) + \varepsilon(b_2)) \\ &= (1-\rho)\varepsilon(b_1) + \rho(\varepsilon(b_1) + \varepsilon(b_2)) \\ &> (1-\rho)\varepsilon(c) + \rho(\varepsilon(c) + \varepsilon(c)) \\ &= \psi(c, c),\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts that (b_1, b_2) is a weighted backup 2-center. □

When computing a weighted backup 2-center, any vertex with weight zero can be treated as a point on an edge, and any edge uv with length zero can be contracted to be a vertex with weight $\max\{w_u, w_v\}$. With this manipulation, an instance with "nonnegative constraints" on vertex weights and edge lengths can be reduced to one with "positive constraints", and there is a straightforward correspondence between the solutions. Therefore, in the discussion below, we may focus on the instances with positive vertex weights and edge lengths.

2.1 A review on Bhattacharya's algorithm

Throughout the rest of this paper, we use the tree given in Figure 1 as an illustrative example. In addition, weighted centers and weighted 2-centers are referred to as centers and 2-centers, respectively, for succinctness. The algorithm of Bhattacharya et al. depends on the following observations.



Fig. 1. A tree $T = (V, E)$. The number beside each vertex and each edge is the weight of the vertex and the length of the edge, respectively. Edges with no number aside are of length one.

Lemma 1 (See [6]). *Let $\{c_1, c_2\}$ be any 2-center. There is a weighted backup 2-center (b_1, b_2) such that b_1 (resp. b_2) lies on a path between c_1 (resp. c_2) and c.*

Lemma 2 (See [6]). *If $\rho > 0$, then $\varepsilon(b_1, V_1) = \varepsilon(b_2, V_2)$ holds for a weighted backup 2-center (b_1, b_2) on a tree, where $(V_1, V_2) = \Pi(b_1, b_2)$.*

By Lemma 1, we may focus the nontrivial case where $c_1 < c < c_2$. The path $\pi(c_1, c_2)$ is embedded onto the x-axis with each point a on $\pi(c_1, c_2)$ corresponding to point $d(a, c_1)$ on the x-axis. For simplicity, we use $\pi(c_1, c_2)$ to denote both the set of points on this path and the corresponding set of points on the x-axis. For each vertex v, the *cost function* $f_v(x)\colon\ \pi(c_1, c_2) \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$f_v(x) = w_v d(v, x).$$

Clearly, f_v is a V-shape function. Assume that the minimum of f_v occurs at a_v. Let $f_v^+\colon\ \pi(c_1, c_2) \to \mathbb{R}$ and $f_v^-\colon\ \pi(c_1, c_2) \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$f_v^+(x) = \begin{cases} f_v(x), & \text{if } x \geqslant a_v \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and } f_v^-(x) = \begin{cases} f_v(x), & \text{if } x \leqslant a_v \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and let the upper envelopes of $\{f_v^+\colon\ v \in V\}$ and $\{f_v^-\colon\ v \in V\}$ be denoted by E_L and E_R, respectively. An example is given in Figure 2(a).

In the algorithm of Bhattacharya et al., they focus on processing the information within the path from c_1 to c_2, where $\{c_1, c_2\}$ is a 2-center satisfying the following property.

Property 1 (See [6]). For the center c, we have $\varepsilon(c) = E_L(c) = E_R(c)$. In addition, there is a 2-center $\{c_1, c_2\}$ satisfying $\varepsilon(c_1, V_1) = E_L(c_1) \leqslant \varepsilon(c)$ and $\varepsilon(c_2, V_2) = E_R(c_2) \leqslant \varepsilon(c)$, where $(V_1, V_2) = \Pi(c_1, c_2)$.

Property 1 holds due to the continuity of the solution space, i.e., the set of points of T. Moreover, it can be derived from Property 1 that for any point pair (x_1, x_2)



Fig. 2. (a) E_L and E_R of the tree T given in Figure 1. Dotted curves are functions f_v, and solid curves are E_L and E_R. (b) Function ψ_1 with different failure probabilities ρ. The failure probability ρ ranges from 0 to 0.9.

with $x_1 \in \pi(c_1, c)$, $x_2 \in \pi(c, c_2)$, and $E_L(x_1) = E_R(x_2)$, the partition $(V_1, V_2) = \Pi(x_1, x_2)$ satisfies $\varepsilon(x_1, V_1) = E_L(x_1) = E_R(x_2) = \varepsilon(x_2, V_2)$ since $\{c_1, c_2\}$ is a 2-center. As a result, Bhattacharya et al. gave an algorithm to compute a weighted backup 2-center on a tree T. We summarize it as in BU2Center-Tree.

BU2Center-Tree(T, ρ)
1 $c \leftarrow$ center of T
2 $\{c_1, c_2\} \leftarrow$ 2-center of T
3 compute E_L and E_R
4 **for** each bending point x_1
5 **do** $x_2 \leftarrow x^*$, where $E_L(x_1) = E_R(x^*)$
6 evaluate $\psi(x_1, x_2)$, and keep the minimum
7 **return** (x_1, x_2)

This algorithm runs in $O(n \log n)$ time, where n is the number of vertices. The bottleneck is the computation of E_L and E_R. Once E_L and E_R are computed, the remainder can be done in $O(n)$ time since there are $O(n)$ *bending points*, at which the function $\psi(x, x^*)$ is not differentiable w.r.t. x. While processing x_1 from left to right, the corresponding x_2 moves monotonically to the left, and therefore a one-pass scan is sufficient to find the optimal solution. Readers can refer to [6] for details. To improve the time complexity, we elaborate on some properties of the objective function below.

2.2 Properties

As in [6], the discussion below focuses on the behavior of the objective function on $\pi(c_1, c_2)$. We observe that the objective function possesses a good property (the



Fig. 3. An example which shows that E_L is not continuous. All vertices are of weight 1 except the bottom one, whose weight is 3. Numbers beside edges are the edge lengths. Clearly, E_L is not continuous at a.

quasiconvexity, given in Lemma 4) when c_1 and c_2 satisfy certain restrictions. The existence of such a 2-center is proved in Proposition 2.

Proposition 2. *For any tree $T = (V, E)$, there is a 2-center $\{c_1, c_2\}$ satisfying $\varepsilon(c_1, V_1) = \varepsilon(c_2, V_2)$, where $(V_1, V_2) = \Pi(c_1, c_2)$.*

Proof. Let $\{c_1', c_2'\}$ be a 2-center, and we embed $\pi(c_1', c_2')$ onto the x-axis as in Section 2.1. Without loss of generality assume that $\varepsilon(c_1', V_1') < \varepsilon(c_2', V_2')$, where $(V_1', V_2') = \Pi(c_1', c_2')$, and it follows that $\varepsilon(c_2', V_2') = E_R(c_2')$ due to the continuity of $\pi(c_1', c_2')$. We claim that one can have the requested 2-center by moving c_1', towards c_2' along $\pi(c_1', c_2')$, to a point a such that $E_L(a) = \varepsilon(c_2', V_2')$. Let $(U_1, U_2) = \Pi(a, c_2')$. Clearly, $V_1 \subseteq U_1$ and $U_2 \subseteq V_2$, and $\varepsilon(c_2', U_2) = \varepsilon(c_2', V_2') = E_R(c_2')$.

Suppose to the contrary that $\{a, c_2'\}$ is not the requested 2-center. It follows that either (i) $\{a, c_2'\}$ is not a 2-center, or (ii) $\varepsilon(a, U_1) \neq \varepsilon(c_2', U_2)$. For (i), there is a vertex u in $U_1 \setminus V_1$ satisfying

$$\varepsilon(c_2', U_2) < \varepsilon(a, U_1) = f_u(a) < f_u(c_2') \leqslant \varepsilon(c_2', V_2),$$

a contradiction. For (ii), it can be derived that $\varepsilon(a, U_1) < \varepsilon(c_2', U_2)$, which contradicts the definition of a. □

Remark 1. Any 2-center $\{c_1, c_2\}$ with $\varepsilon(c_1, V_1) = \varepsilon(c_2, V_2)$ satisfies $E_L(c_1) = \varepsilon(c_1, V_1) = \varepsilon(c_2, V_2) = E_R(c_2)$. Once a 2-center is computed, $\{c_1, c_2\}$ can then be computed in linear time, based on the arguments in the proof of Proposition 2.

In the rest of this paper, we assume that $\{c_1, c_2\}$ is a 2-center satisfying $\varepsilon(c_1, V_1) = \varepsilon(c_2, V_2)$, where $(V_1, V_2) = \Pi(c_1, c_2)$. Next, we elaborate on E_L and E_R. As noted in [6], both E_L and E_R are piecewise linear. On a path, both E_L and E_R are obviously continuous and convex. It also holds on $\pi(c_1, c_2)$ in a tree, as shown in Lemma 3.

Lemma 3. *Let $\{c_1, c_2\}$ be a 2-center of a tree satisfying $E_L(c_1) = \varepsilon(c_1, V_1) = \varepsilon(c_2, V_2) = E_R(c_2)$, where $(V_1, V_2) = \Pi(c_1, c_2)$. The function E_L and E_R are continuous and convex on $\pi(c_1, c_2)$.*

Proof. Because of symmetry, we prove the lemma only for E_L, and we claim that E_L is continuous. The convexity then follows since E_L is the upper envelope of half lines of positive slope. Suppose to the contrary that E_L is not continuous. There is a point a, with $c_1 < a < c_2$, satisfying $\lim_{x\to a^-} E_L(x) < E_L(a)$. Let $E_L(a) = f_v^+(a)$. Clearly, at point a we have $f_v^+(a) = f_v^-(a)$. It follows that $a \notin V_1$ since otherwise $E_L(c_1) \neq \varepsilon(c_1, V_1)$. However, for $a \in V_2$, we have

$$\varepsilon(c_2, V_2) = \varepsilon(c_1, V_1) = E_L(c_1) < E_L(a) = f_v^+(a) < f_v^+(c_2) \leqslant \varepsilon(c_2, V_2),$$

which leads to a contradiction. □

Notice that Lemma 3 does not hold for all 2-centers. An example is given in Figure 3.

By Lemma 2, an optimal solution occurs at the point pair (a, a^*) satisfying $a \in \pi(c_1, c)$, $a^* \in \pi(c, c_2)$, and $E_L(a) = E_R(a^*)$. Thus, we may focus on the single variable function $\psi_1 \colon \pi(c_1, c) \to \mathbb{R}$, defined as

$$\psi_1(a) = \psi(a, a^*).$$

To design an efficient algorithm, we expect some good properties on ψ_1. Unlike the eccentricity function ε, function ψ_1 is not convex on $\pi(c_1, c)$ (see Figure 2(b)). Fortunately, it is quasiconvex. Moreover, for any interval $[c_1, x^*]$ with $c_1 \leqslant x^* \leqslant c$, if there is no more than one point at which ψ_1 attains the minimum, then ψ_1 is strictly quasiconvex on $[c_1, x^*]$ (see Lemma 4).

Lemma 4 (strict quasiconvexity). *For $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$, the following statements hold.*

- *$\psi_1(a_3) < \psi_1(a_2)$ implies $\psi_1(a_2) < \psi_1(a_1)$;*
- *$\psi_1(a_1) < \psi_1(a_2)$ implies $\psi_1(a_2) < \psi_1(a_3)$.*

Proof. We prove only the statement that $\psi_1(a_3) < \psi_1(a_2)$ implies $\psi_1(a_2) < \psi_1(a_1)$. The other statement can be proved in a similar way. With the assumption that $\psi_1(a_3) < \psi_1(a_2)$, we have

$$(1-\rho)E_L(a_3) + \rho(E_R(a_3) + E_L(a_3^*)) < (1-\rho)E_L(a_2) + \rho(E_R(a_2) + E_L(a_2^*)),$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1-\rho}{\rho} &< \frac{E_R(a_2) - E_R(a_3) + E_L(a_2^*) - E_L(a_3^*)}{E_L(a_3) - E_L(a_2)} \\
&= \frac{E_R(a_2) - E_R(a_3)}{E_L(a_3) - E_L(a_2)} + \frac{E_L(a_2^*) - E_L(a_3^*)}{E_R(a_3^*) - E_R(a_2^*)} \\
&= \frac{(E_R(a_2) - E_R(a_3))/d(a_2, a_3)}{(E_L(a_3) - E_L(a_2))/d(a_2, a_3)} + \frac{(E_L(a_2^*) - E_L(a_3^*))/d(a_2^*, a_3^*)}{(E_R(a_3^*) - E_R(a_2^*))/d(a_2^*, a_3^*)} \\
&\underset{Lemma\ 3}{\leqslant} \frac{(E_R(a_1) - E_R(a_2))/d(a_1, a_2)}{(E_L(a_2) - E_L(a_1))/d(a_1, a_2)} + \frac{(E_L(a_1^*) - E_L(a_2^*))/d(a_1^*, a_2^*)}{(E_R(a_2^*) - E_R(a_1^*))/d(a_1^*, a_2^*)} \\
&= \frac{E_R(a_1) - E_R(a_2) + E_L(a_1^*) - E_L(a_2^*)}{E_L(a_2) - E_L(a_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\psi_1(a_2) < \psi_1(a_1)$. □

We note here that Lemma 4 holds for function $\psi_2 \colon \pi(c, c_2) \to \mathbb{R}$ in a symmetric manner, where

$$\psi_2(a) = \psi(a^*, a).$$

This property will be used in designing our algorithm, and its proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.

3 A linear time algorithm

The bottleneck on the time complexity of the algorithm of Bhattacharya et al. is the computation of E_L and E_R. Fortunately, due to the strict quasiconvexity of ψ_1 and the piecewise linearity of E_L and E_R, one can apply the strategy of prune-and-search [10, 14] to obtain an optimal solution in linear time. The quasiconvexity of a function f implies that a local minimum of f is the global minimum of f, and the idea of the prune-and-search algorithm is to search the local minimum over an interval $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$, which is guaranteed to contain the solution. In the search procedure, $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ is recursively reduced to a subinterval, and once it is reduced, the size of the instance can also be pruned with a fixed proportion. In more detail, the following steps are executed in each recursive call:

1. Choose a point t in $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ appropriately. Initially, $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2] = [c_1, c]$.
2. Determine whether $t < b_1$, $t = b_1$, or $t > b_1$.
3. Depending on the result of step 2, update $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$, and discard a subset of vertices without affecting the local optimality of b_1 over the updated interval.

During the execution, we claim that the following invariant is maintained. Recall that for any point a in $\pi(c_1, c)$, a^* is a point in $\pi(c, c_2)$ such that $E_L(a) = E_R(a^*)$.

Claim (invariant). In each recursive call, the 6-tuple $(U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ satisfies

- $b_1 \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$;
- for each $a \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$, $E_L(a) = \max_{v \in U_1} f_v^+(a)$, $E_R(a) = \max_{v \in U_2} f_v^-(a)$, $E_L(a^*) = \max_{v \in U_3} f_v^+(a^*)$, and $E_R(a^*) = \max_{v \in U_4} f_v^-(a^*)$.

The invariant was maintained by the procedure ReduceInstance1, as shown later in Section 3.3. We note here that to guarantee the efficiency, the steps above have to be repeated in a symmetric manner (ReduceInstance2). The reason will be clear after the elaboration below. To ease the presentation, we assume that the failure probability ρ can be accessed globally by each procedure. The details of steps 1 and 3 are given in Section 3.1, that of step 2 is given in Section 3.2, and the analysis of the algorithm is given in Section 3.3.



Fig. 4. (a) The instance before the execution of ReduceInstance1(V, V, V, V, c_1, c). In the execution, every two vertices in U_i, from left to right, is paired in the partition $\Pi(U_i)$, $\{t^+_{uv}\colon \{u,v\} \in \Pi(U_1)\} \cup \{t^-_{uv}\colon \{u,v\} \in \Pi(U_2)\} = \{3, -2, 49/4, 29/4, 5/2\} \cup \{-3, 2/3, 39/4, 25/4, 21/2\}$, and t is chosen as $37/8$ (the mean of 3 and $25/4$). (b) The instance after the execution of ReduceInstance1(V, V, V, V, c_1, c). Hollow circles denote the discarded elements from $U_1 \cup U_2$. Notice that elements in U_1 and U_2 need not be sorted.

3.1 Guaranteeing the discarded proportion of vertices

The proportion of vertices discarded at step 3 depends essentially on how the point t at step 1 is chosen. According to the piecewise linearity of E_L and E_R, the discarded proportion can be guaranteed based on the following simple property.

Property 2. Consider two linear functions $f_1(x) = a_1x + b_1$ and $f_2(x) = a_2x + b_2$ with $a_1 > a_2$. We have $f_1(x) \leqslant f_2(x)$ if and only if $x \leqslant \frac{b_2 - b_1}{a_1 - a_2}$.

Similar to the idea in [10, 14], for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we arbitrarily partition U_i into $\lfloor |U_i|/2 \rfloor$ pairs of vertices, and a single one if $|U_i|$ is odd, and let this partition be denoted by $\Pi(U_i)$. Moreover, let $t^+_{uv} = \varsigma(f^+_u, f^+_v)$ and $t^-_{uv} = \varsigma(f^-_u, f^-_v)$, where $\varsigma(f_1, f_2)$ denotes the point at which f_1 and f_2 intersect. If t_m, the median of $\{t^+_{uv}\colon \{u,v\} \in \Pi(U_1)\} \cup \{t^-_{uv}\colon \{u,v\} \in \Pi(U_2)\}$, is chosen at step 1, then after step 2, $\lceil (\lfloor |U_1|/2 \rfloor + \lfloor |U_2|/2 \rfloor)/2 \rceil$ vertices can be discarded without affecting the optimality of b_1 in either $[\lambda_1, \min\{t_m, \lambda_2\}]$ or $[\max\{t_m, \lambda_1\}, \lambda_2]$. We implement the above mentioned steps by PairPartitionMedian and DiscardVertices, where PairPartitionMedian pairs vertices in U_1 and U_2, respectively, and choosing the median t_m; based on the result and the updated interval containing the solution, i.e., $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$, DiscardVertices does the process of discarding vertices. An illustration is given in Figure 4.

PairPartitionMedian(U_1, U_2)

1 $X_1 \leftarrow \Pi(U_1)$
2 $X_2 \leftarrow \Pi(U_2)$
3 $t_m \leftarrow$ the median of $\{t^+_{uv} \colon \{u,v\} \in X_1\} \cup \{t^-_{uv} \colon \{u,v\} \in X_2\}$
4 **return** (t_m, X_1, X_2)

DiscardVertices$(X_1, X_2, t, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$

1 $U_1 \leftarrow \emptyset$
2 $U_2 \leftarrow \emptyset$
3 **if** $t \leqslant \lambda_1$ ▷ $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ is updated, so either $t \leqslant \lambda_1$ or $t \geqslant \lambda_2$
4 **then for** each element x in X_1
5 **do if** $x = \{u, v\}$ and $\varsigma(f^+_u, f^+_v) \leqslant t$
6 **then** $U_1 \leftarrow U_1 \cup \{u \colon f^+_u(t+\epsilon) > f^+_v(t+\epsilon)\}$
7 **else** $U_1 \leftarrow U_1 \cup \{x\}$
8 **for** each element x in X_2
9 **do if** $x = \{u, v\}$ and $\varsigma(f^-_u, f^-_v) \leqslant t$
10 **then** $U_2 \leftarrow U_2 \cup \{u \colon f^-_u(t+\epsilon) > f^-_v(t+\epsilon)\}$
11 **else** $U_2 \leftarrow U_2 \cup \{x\}$
12 **else for** each element x in X_1
13 **do if** $x = \{u, v\}$ and $\varsigma(f^+_u, f^+_v) \geqslant t$
14 **then** $U_1 \leftarrow U_1 \cup \{u \colon f^+_u(t-\epsilon) > f^+_v(t-\epsilon)\}$
15 **else** $U_1 \leftarrow U_1 \cup \{x\}$
16 **for** each element x in X_2
17 **do if** $x = \{u, v\}$ and $\varsigma(f^-_u, f^-_v) \geqslant t$
18 **then** $U_2 \leftarrow U_2 \cup \{u \colon f^-_u(t-\epsilon) > f^-_v(t-\epsilon)\}$
19 **else** $U_2 \leftarrow U_2 \cup \{x\}$
20 **return** (U_1, U_2)

Remark 2. We use ϵ to denote a sufficiently small value such that the following relation holds. For two linear function f and g,

$$f(t+\epsilon) < g(t+\epsilon) \Leftrightarrow a_1 < a_2, \text{ or } a_1 = a_2 \text{ and } b_1 < b_2,$$

where $f(t+\epsilon) = a_1 + b_1\epsilon$ and $g(t+\epsilon) = a_2 + b_2\epsilon$. As a result, no exact value has to be specified for ϵ in DiscardVertices. This convention is also adopted in Section 3.2.

3.2 Evaluating ψ_1

Step 2 can be done via evaluating $\psi_1(t_m)$ and $\psi_1(t_m - \epsilon)$. Due to the quasiconvexity of ψ_1 (Lemma 4), we have that

- if $\psi_1(t_m - \epsilon) > \psi_1(t_m)$, then $b_1 > t_m$;
- if $\psi_1(t_m - \epsilon) \leqslant \psi_1(t_m)$, then there exists $b_1 \leqslant t_m$.

Recall that $\psi_1(a) = (1-\rho)E_L(a) + \rho(E_R(a) + E_L(a^*))$, where $E_R(a^*) = E_L(a)$. For a point a on $\pi(c_1, c)$, the evaluation of $\psi_1(a)$ can be done via computing

$E_L(a)$, $E_R(a)$, and $E_L(a^*)$. According to the claim of invariant, for $a \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$, we have

$$E_L(a) = \max\{f_v^+(a)\colon\ v \in U_1\} \text{ and } E_R(a) = \max\{f_v^-(a)\colon\ v \in U_2\}.$$

Clearly, $E_L(a)$ and $E_R(a)$ can be computed in time linear to $|U_1|$ and $|U_2|$, respectively. If a^* is given, then $E_L(a^*)$ can also be computed in $O(|U_4|)$ time. It remains to show how a^* is determined.

Given a value ξ, since $E_R(a) = \max\{f_v^-(a)\colon\ v \in U_3\}$, the point a on $\pi(c, c_2)$ satisfies $E_R(a) = \xi$ if and only if

$$a = \max\{x\colon\ f_v^-(x) = \xi, v \in U_3\}.$$

Therefore, for $a \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$, determining a^* can be done in $O(|U_3|)$ time, and $E_L(a^*)$ can then be computed in $O(|U_4|)$ time. Formally, the procedure of evaluating ψ_1 at point a in $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ is given as EVALUATE1(a, U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4).

EVALUATE1(a, U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4)
1 $\xi_1 \leftarrow \max\{f_v^+(a)\colon\ v \in U_1\}$
2 $\xi_2 \leftarrow \max\{f_v^-(a)\colon\ v \in U_2\}$
3 $a^* \leftarrow \max\{x\colon\ f_v^-(x) = \xi_1, v \in U_4\}$
4 $\xi_3 \leftarrow \max\{f_v^-(a^*)\colon\ v \in U_3\}$
5 **return** $(1-\rho)\xi_1 + \rho(\xi_2 + \xi_3)$

The evaluation of ψ_2 at a given point a can be done symmetrically, and the details are omitted.

3.3 The analysis of the algorithm

With the procedures given in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, we may implement the idea given in the beginning of Section 3, which recursively reduces the size of the problem instance. The procedure is given as REDUCEINSTANCE1.

REDUCEINSTANCE1$(U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$
1 $(t, X_1, X_2) \leftarrow$ PAIRPARTITIONMEDIAN(U_1, U_2)
2 $\xi_1 \leftarrow$ EVALUATE1$(t - \epsilon, U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4)$
3 $\xi_2 \leftarrow$ EVALUATE1(t, U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4)
4 **if** $\xi_1 < \xi_2$
5 **then** $\lambda_2 \leftarrow \min\{t, \lambda_2\}$
6 **else** $\lambda_1 \leftarrow \max\{t, \lambda_1\}$
7 $(U_1, U_2) \leftarrow$ DISCARDVERTICES$(X_1, X_2, t, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$
8 **return** $(U_1, U_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$

An example is given in Figure 4. Since t is chosen as the median of $\{t^+_{uv}\colon \{u,v\} \in \Pi(U_1)\} \cup \{t^-_{uv}\colon \{u,v\} \in \Pi(U_2)\}$ (line 1), it can be derived that a fixed proportion of vertices in $U_1 \cup U_2$ are discarded after the execution of DiscardVertices (line 7). Moreover, together with Property 2, it can be easily derived that for $a \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$, $\psi_1(a)$ remains unchanged. We summarize these properties in Lemma 5.

Lemma 5. *After the execution of* ReduceInstance1$(U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$*, at least* $\left\lceil \frac{\lfloor n_1/2 \rfloor + \lfloor n_2/2 \rfloor}{2} \right\rceil$ *vertices of* $U_1 \cup U_2$ *are discarded, where* $n_1 = |U_1|$ *and* $n_2 = |U_2|$*. Moreover, the procedure maintains the invariant, the 6-tuple* $(U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$*, in which*

- $b_1 \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$*;*
- *for* $a \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$*,* $E_L(a) = \max\{f^+_v(a)\colon v \in U_1\}$*,* $E_R(a) = \max\{f^-_v(a)\colon v \in U_2\}$*,* $E_L(a^*) = \max\{f^+_v(a^*)\colon v \in U_3\}$*,* $E_R(a^*) = \max\{f^-_v(a^*)\colon v \in U_4\}$*.*

Notice that after the execution of ReduceInstance1$(U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, only a proportion of $U_1 \cup U_2$ is discarded. To ensure that a fixed proportion of the instance is pruned, in a symmetric manner, one can apply a similar procedure to discard a proportion of $U_3 \cup U_4$, as noted in the beginning of Section 3. We name the corresponding procedure as ReduceInstance2.

Remark 3. ReduceInstance2 is the same as ReduceInstance1 except it evaluates ψ_2 instead of ψ_1 (see lines 2 and 3 of ReduceInstance1).

With ReduceInstance1 and ReduceInstance2, one may recursively reduce the size of the instance until the instance is small enough. For small instance with both $|U_1 \cup U_2| \leqslant 3$ and $|U_3 \cup U_4| \leqslant 3$, we compute the solution by evaluating ψ_1 at all bending points in $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ since ψ_1 is piecewise linear. We denote this procedure by SmallInstance.

The integration is given as PruneAndSearch, and the procedure for computing a weighted backup 2-center is given as Backup2Center. The correctness and time complexity are analyzed in Theorem 1.

PruneAndSearch$(U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$

1 **if** $|U_1 \cup U_2| \leqslant 3$ and $|U_3 \cup U_4| \leqslant 3$
2 **then return** SmallInstance$(U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$
3 **else** $(U'_1, U'_2, \lambda'_1, \lambda'_2) \leftarrow$ ReduceInstance1$(U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$
4 $(U'_3, U'_4, \lambda'_3, \lambda'_4) \leftarrow$ ReduceInstance2$(U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$
5 **return** PruneAndSearch$(U'_1, U'_2, U'_3, U'_4, \lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3, \lambda'_4)$

Backup2Center(T, ρ)

1 $c \leftarrow$ center of T
2 $(c_1, c_2) \leftarrow$ 2-center of T with the property in Proposition 2
3 **return** PruneAndSearch$(V, V, V, V, c_1, c, c, c_2)$
$\triangleright$ V is the vertex set of T

Theorem 1. *The weighted backup 2-center problem on a tree can be solved in linear time by* Backup2Center.

Proof. Let $T = (V, E)$ with $|V| = n$. By Lemma 1, $b_1 \in [c_1, c]$ and $b_2 \in [c, c_2]$, and thus λ_1, λ_2, λ_3, and λ_4 are initialized accordingly as in Backup2Center. Besides, by definition, we have $E_L(a) = \max\{f_v^+(a)\colon v \in V\}$ and $E_R(a) = \max\{f_v^-(a)\colon v \in V\}$. With Lemma 5, the initialization of $U_1 = V$ and $U_2 = V$ guarantees $\psi_1(a)$, for $a \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$, is computed correctly. Similar arguments hold for the initialization of $U_3 = V$ and $U_4 = V$.

For the time complexity, both the center and the 2-center can be computed in $O(n)$ time [4,10]. For PruneAndSearch, let $n_1 = |U_1|$, $n_2 = |U_2|$, $n_3 = |U_3|$, and $n_4 = |U_4|$. Lines 3–5 of PruneAndSearch are executed if either $|U_1 \cup U_2| \geqslant 4$ or $|U_3 \cup U_4| \geqslant 4$. Together with Lemma 5, it can be derived that

$$\left\lceil \frac{\lfloor n_1/2 \rfloor + \lfloor n_2/2 \rfloor}{2} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{\lfloor n_3/2 \rfloor + \lfloor n_4/2 \rfloor}{2} \right\rceil \geqslant \frac{1}{8}(n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4), \quad (1)$$

where the equality holds when $n_1 = 3$, $n_2 = 3$, $n_3 = 1$, and $n_4 = 1$. As a result, let the execution time of PruneAndSearch$(V, V, V, V, c_1, c, c, c_2)$ be $T(N)$, where $N = |V| + |V| + |V| + |V| = 4n$. It follows from (1) that

$$T(N) \leqslant T\left(\frac{7N}{8}\right) + O(N).$$

Therefore, $T(N) = O(N) = O(n)$. □

4 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we propose a linear time algorithm to solve the weighted backup 2-center problem on a tree, which is asymptotically optimal. Based on the observations given by Bhattacharya et al. [6], "good properties" of the objective function are further derived. With these properties, the strategy of prune-and-search can be applied to solve this problem. For future research, the hardness of the backup p-center problem on trees is still unknown, even for the unweighted case. It worth investigation on this direction.

Acknowledgements The author would also like to thank Professor Kun-Mao Chao, Ming-Wei Shao, and Jhih-Heng Huang for fruitful discussions. Hung-Lung Wang was supported in part by MOST grant 103-2221-E-141-004, from the Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan.

References

1. Albareda-Sambola, M., Díaz, J. A., Fernández, E.: Lagrangean duals and exact solution to the capacitated p-center problem. Eur. J. Oper. Res. 201, 71–81 (2010).

2. Averbakh, I., Berman O.: Minimax regret p-center location on a network with demand uncertainty. Location Science 5, 247–254 (1997).
3. Averbakh, I., Berman, O.: Algorithms for the robust 1-center problem on a tree. Eur. J. Oper. Res. 123, 292–302 (2000).
4. Ben-Moshe, B., Bhattacharya, B., Shi, Q.: An optimal algorithm for the continuous/discrete weighted 2-center problem in trees. Proc. 7th Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics (LNCS 3887), Valdivia, Chile, pp. 166–177 (2006).
5. Ben-Moshe, B., Bhattacharya, B., Shi, Q., Tamir, A.: Efficient algorithms for center problems in cactus networks. Theor. Compt. Sci. 378, 237–252 (2007).
6. Bhattacharya, B., De, M., Kameda, T., Roy, S., Sokol, V., Song, Z.: Back-up 2-center on a path/tree/cycle/unicycle. Proc. 20th International Conference on Computing and Combinatorics (LNCS 8591), Atlanta, GA, USA, pp. 417–428 (2014).
7. Frederickson, G. N.: Parametric search and locating supply centers in trees. Proc. 2nd Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures (LNCS 519), Ottawa, Canada, pp. 299–319 (1991).
8. Hong, Y., Kang, L.: Backup 2-center on interval graphs. Theor. Comput. Sci. 445, 25–35 (2012).
9. Kariv, O., Hakimi, S. L.: An algorithmic approach to network location problems, Part I. The p-centers. SIAM J. Appl. Math. 37, 441–461 (1979).
10. Megiddo, N.: Linear-time algorithms for linear programming in R^3 and related problems, SIAM J. Comput. 12, 759–776 (1983).
11. Plesník, J.: A heuristic for the p-center problem in graphs. Discrete Appl. Math. 17, 263–268 (1987).
12. Snyder, L. V.: Facility location under uncertainty: A review. IIE Trans. 38, 537–554 (2006).
13. Snyder, L. V., Daskin, M. S.: Reliability models for facility location: The expected failure cost case. Transport. Sci. 39, 400–416 (2005).
14. Tamir, A.: Sorting weighted distances with applications to objective function evaluations in single facility location problems. Oper. Res. Lett. 32, 249–257 (2004).
15. Wang, H.-L., Wu, B. Y., Chao, K.-M.: The backup 2-center and backup 2-median problems on trees. Networks 53, 39–49 (2009).